

From: Hall, Lynda
To: Psyk, Christine; Joelle Gore (joelle.gore@noaa.gov)
Sent: 9/25/2014 10:05:25 AM
Subject: RE: Issue with staff papers OR CZARA

Thanks Christine. I think this covers much of what we would need and would facilitate better decisionmaking.

Ex. 5 - Deliberative

Ex. 5 - Deliberative I've proposed some other edits below as well.

Lynda

From: Psyk, Christine
Sent: Wednesday, September 24, 2014 12:53 PM
To: Hall, Lynda; Joelle Gore (joelle.gore@noaa.gov)
Subject: RE: Issue with staff papers OR CZARA

Lynda, I think you are making a very good point. I too am finding it very challenging to review these staff papers. I like the idea of a template. I agree that we should identify the elements that we want to see in the template to give staff some guidance on what's important for our decision making and for briefing it up to senior management.

To start the ball rolling on the elements that the template should contain, here are my thoughts:

- Identify Management Measure
- Text of the MM (from G guidance or Agency documentation of additional MMs)
- How State Submittal does or does not address the Measure; if it does not address the measure what are the specific ways it does not do so, using all reasonable interpretations of the MM
- Brief summary of comments and/or new information on the proposed disapproval: from the state and members of the Public
- Options and/or Recommendations

What do you think? What's missing? Is this too much/too little? Perhaps through exchange of email we can nail down the key elements that are important to the three of us and check signals this Thursday during our call. We can then quickly communicate to staff what we're looking for.

Christine Psyk, Associate Director
EPA Region 10, OWW
206-553-1906
Psyk.christine@epa.gov

From: Hall, Lynda
Sent: Tuesday, September 23, 2014 9:35 AM
To: Psyk, Christine; Joelle Gore (joelle.gore@noaa.gov)
Subject: Issue with staff papers OR CZARA

Christine and Joelle,

I am finding it challenging to review with confidence the staff papers and wonder if we should request more rigor in the write-ups.

-The landslides paper referenced below is one page, does not reference the MMs which we are assessing, and has little to no information on what OR's program has in place in this regard (perhaps the answer to that questions is "nothing," but if so that should still be noted explicitly in the decision papers).

-The forest roads paper which we have in-hand does have the MMs presented in detail, and includes a fair amount of background. The actual information on what constitutes OR's program is one or two bullets with no details.

I am finding the current process and approach to be somewhat scattered and the materials don't provide the basis we have asked for that there is a clear assessment of OR's program against the MMs. What do you think of identifying all the key pieces we would like to see in the issue papers and asking the team to come up with a template for them. I am thinking along the lines of a table that would lay out the language of the MMs and for each element would have an associated column with description and insufficiencies for OR's program. But this could take any number of forms.

For myself this would support more informed decisionmaking and I think it would also facilitate preparation of briefings and issue papers for senior management, which we need to start thinking about soon.

Thoughts?

Lynda

From: Psyk, Christine
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2014 4:23 PM
To: Henning, Alan
Cc: joelle.gore@noaa.gov; Hall, Lynda
Subject: Landslides Write-up

Alan, I have reviewed the Landslides write-up and have no comments. The paper that I reviewed had no recommendations one way or the other and it had no date. I am wondering whether I reviewed the most current one.

Christine Psyk, Associate Director
EPA Region 10, OWW
206-553-1906
Psyk.christine@epa.gov